HOUSE OF COMMONS SESSION 1999–2000

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Fourth Report

GLAXO WELLCOME AND SMITHKLINE BEECHAM

Volume I

Report and Proceedings of the Committee

Ordered by The House of Commons *to be printed*
27 March 2000

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON – THE STATIONERY OFFICE LIMITED
£4·30

HC 207–I

[illegible]
LIBRARY
General Collections
P
6101

22501526499

HOUSE OF COMMONS SESSION 1999–2000

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

WELLCOME TRUST INFORMATION SERVICE
16 MAY 2000
ACC. No.
CLASS: PCA Hou/C

Fourth Report

GLAXO WELLCOME AND SMITHKLINE BEECHAM

Volume I

Report and Proceedings of the Committee

Ordered by The House of Commons *to be printed*
27 March 2000

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON – THE STATIONERY OFFICE LIMITED
£4·30

HC 207–I

The Science and Technology Committee

The Science and Technology Committee is appointed to examine on behalf of the House of Commons the expenditure, administration and policy of the Office of Science and Technology (and any associated public bodies). Its constitution and powers are set out in House of Commons Standing Order No. 152.

The Committee has a maximum of eleven members, of whom the quorum for any formal proceedings is three. The members of the Committee are appointed by the House and unless discharged remain on the Committee until the next dissolution of Parliament. The present membership of the Committee is as follows:[1]

Dr Michael Clark MP *(Conservative, Rayleigh)*[2]
Dr Brian Iddon MP (*Labour, , Bolton South East)*[5]
Mrs Claire Curtis-Thomas MP (*Labour, Crosby*)[2]
Dr Ian Gibson MP (*Labour, Norwich North*)[2]
Mr Robert Jackson MP (*Conservative, Wantage*)[3]
Dr Lynne Jones MP (*Labour, Birmingham Selly Oak*)[2]
Mr Nigel Jones MP (*Liberal Democrat, Cheltenham*)[2]
Dr Ashok Kumar MP (*Labour, Middlesborough South and East Cleveland*)[2]
Mr Ian Taylor MP (*Conservative, Esher and Walton*)[4]
Dr Desmond Turner MP (*Labour, Brighton Kemptown*)[2]
Dr Alan W Williams MP (*Labour, Carmarthen East and Dinefwr*)[2]

On 30 July 1997, the Committee elected Dr Michael Clark as its Chairman.

The Committee has the power to require the submission of written evidence and documents, to examine witnesses, and to make Reports to the House. In the footnotes to this Report, references to oral evidence are indicated by 'Q' followed by the question number, references to the written evidence are indicated by 'Ev' followed by a page number.

The Committee may meet at any time (except when Parliament is prorogued or dissolved) and at any place within the United Kingdom. The Committee may meet concurrently with other committees or sub-committees established under Standing Order No. 152 for the purposes of deliberating, taking evidence or considering draft reports. The Committee may meet concurrently with the House's European Scrutiny Committee (or any of its sub-committees) or the Environmental Audit Committee for the purposes of deliberating or taking evidence. The Committee may exchange documents and evidence with any of these committees, as well as with the House's Public Accounts and Deregulation Committees.

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at www.parliament.uk/commons/selcom/s&thome.htm. A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Parliament is at the end of this volume.

All correspondence should be addressed to The Clerk of the Science and Technology Committee, Committee Office, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general inquiries is: 020 7219 2794; the Committee's e-mail address is: scitechcom@parliament.uk.

---

[1] Mrs Caroline Spelman MP (*Conservative, Meriden*) was appointed on 14 July 1997 and discharged on 22 June 1998.
Mr David Atkinson MP (*Conservative, Bournemouth*) was appointed on 14 July 1997 and discharged on 30 November 1998.
Mrs Jacqui Lait MP (*Conservative, Beckenham*) was appointed on 22 June 1998 and discharged on 5 July 1999.
Mr Nigel Beard MP (Labour, Bexleyheath and Crayford) was appointed on 14 July 1997 and discharged on 20 March 2000.

[2] Appointed on 14 July 1997.

[3] Appointed on 5 July 1999.

[4] Appointed on 30 November 1998.

[5] Appointed on 20 March 2000.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

REPORT v

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS iv

GLAXO WELLCOME AND SMITHKLINE BEECHAM v

- Our inquiry v
- The Proposed Merger and its Implications for the UK Science Base v
- Conclusions viii

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE RELATING TO THE REPORT ix

LIST OF WITNESSES x

MEMORANDUM INCLUDED IN THE MINUTES OF EVIDENCE xi

LIST OF APPENDICES TO THE MINUTES OF EVIDENCE xii

UNPRINTED MEMORANDA xii

LIST OF REPORTS xiii

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

(a) **Provided that investment in R&D and involvement with the UK science base is maintained at, as a minimum, the same level as the current combined activities of SmithKline Beecham and Glaxo Wellcome, the creation of Glaxo SmithKline, with an annual R&D budget of some £2.4 billion, of which roughly half is expected to be spent in the UK, is potentially a huge asset for the science base and for the UK economy as a whole (paragraph 5).**

(b) **We understand that consolidation of R&D activities will result in estimated savings of £250 million but have been assured that this will be re-invested in R&D and that the employment effect in research facilities will be minimal. We expect the new company to abide by these assurances and shall monitor its R&D activities (paragraph 7).**

(c) **The Government must ensure that there is a strong public sector research base, at all levels, to provide industry with leading-edge research and the highly skilled staff which are "the life-blood of technology-based industry". Equally it must provide an economic and fiscal environment that supports those who invest in R&D and stimulates such investment on the part of others. Only by achieving these aims can the UK maintain the degree and breadth of excellence in the science base that is essential if UK-based companies are to compete successfully in a knowledge-driven, global economy (paragraph 9).**

(d) **Glaxo SmithKline has the potential to become a national champion, competing across the world, and, with nearly 50% of its R&D activities undertaken in the UK, would be a powerful advertisement for the quality and expertise of the UK science base (paragraph 10).**

(e) **The Government must continue to invest in the science base, and must build on that investment, if companies are to continue to conduct their R&D operations in the UK or, indeed, are to be attracted here from elsewhere. This is essential to the competitiveness of UK industry (paragraph 11).**

FOURTH REPORT

The Science and Technology Committee has agreed to the following Report:—

GLAXO WELLCOME AND SMITHKLINE BEECHAM

Our inquiry

1. On 17 January 2000, it was announced that the Boards of Glaxo Wellcome and SmithKline Beecham had agreed unanimously the terms of a proposed merger of the two companies to form Glaxo SmithKline. The merger, if it is approved by the regulatory authorities and the companies' shareholders, will create the world's largest pharmaceutical company with annual sales of over £15 billion and 7.3% of the global pharmaceuticals market. On an earlier occasion, on 30 January 1998, Glaxo Wellcome plc and SmithKline Beecham plc announced that they had entered talks with a view to merging the two companies. On 23 February 1998, after twenty three days of talks, SmithKline Beecham announced that those negotiations had been terminated amid suggestions that Glaxo Wellcome had failed to abide by earlier agreements and rumours of insolvable differences between the companies' Boards. We examined both companies at that time but, although both provided us with their interpretation of why the talks had failed, the precise reasons remained, and still remain, unclear.

2. On 21 February 2000 we examined Sir Richard Sykes, the executive Chairman of Glaxo Wellcome plc and non-executive chairman of Glaxo SmithKline designate, and Mr Jean Pierre Garnier, Chief Executive Officer Elect of SmithKline Beecham plc and Chief Executive Officer designate of Glaxo SmithKline. We also received written submissions from the two companies involved, from the Institution of Professionals, Managers and Specialists (IPMS) and the Manufacturing, Science and Finance Union (MSF) and from the Royal Society of Chemistry. We are grateful to all who have assisted in our inquiry.

The Proposed Merger and its Implications for the UK Science Base

3. Our interest in the companies, and thus in their merger proposals, results from the scale of their influence on the UK science base. Both Glaxo Wellcome and SmithKline Beecham are giants in terms of their research and development (R&D) activities; in 1999 they ranked first and second, respectively, in the Department of Trade and Industry's *R&D Scoreboard* and between them they account for more than a fifth of all private sector investment in R&D in the UK.[1] Compared to the distribution of sales globally, both companies conduct a disproportionate amount of their R&D in the UK. In 1998 SmithKline Beecham's R&D expenditure amounted to £910 million globally, of which £330 million, or some 36%, was invested in the UK. In contrast, in the same year, only 5% of its global pharmaceutical sales were in the UK.[2] Similarly, Glaxo Wellcome, with 7% of its sales in the UK, invested 42% (£507 million) of its total 1998 R&D expenditure of £1.2 billion in the UK.[3] Both are active, and important, supporters of the UK science base. SmithKline Beecham provides training at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels, participates in multilateral LINK, Foresight and Framework 5 research activities and provides intellectual and financial assistance to a number of UK universities.[4] Glaxo Wellcome too has a wide network of collaborations with UK universities. In 1998, it spent over £17 million on fundamental research through a variety of means and on sponsorship of research Chairs and fellowships. It also supports the training of over 260 postgraduate students across 54 universities and provides work placements for over 240 sandwich students. Additionally, some £35 million per annum is spent in universities, hospitals and institutes in the UK on clinical research and therapeutic trials. The sheer size, breadth and penetration of the companies' R&D operations in the UK leads to the inevitable conclusion that, if the merger were to result in even a small change in investment levels or interaction, there would be a ripple effect throughout the entire UK science base. This indicates the risk factor to

---

[1] R&D Scoreboard 1999.

[2] Ev. pp. 1 and 2.

[3] Ev. pp. 1 and 2.

[4] Approximately £8 million annual. See Ev. p. 2.

the science base from over-reliance on significant support from too few members of the corporate sector.

4. We asked our witnesses why they believed that the current merger proposals would reach a successful conclusion now when this had proved impossible in 1998. Sir Richard told us that "the rationale for the merger ... has not changed but at that time the boards of both companies decided that the time was not right to bring these two companies together. Over time things have changed. We have reached a position now where the boards of both companies are very enthusiastic about this deal. They recognise that today bringing the companies together ... will enable us to realise all the potential that we have talked about for so long".[5] Mr Garnier told us, for instance, that on the manufacturing side, the two companies had been organised in very different ways but that, partly because of the discussions in 1998, and partly by "observing best practice" in Glaxo Wellcome, SmithKline Beecham had been able, over the intervening period, to transform its manufacturing operations.[6] Similarly, Glaxo Wellcome has aligned its manufacturing supply chain to SmithKline Beecham's procedures.[7] We do not find these arguments entirely convincing. We do not underestimate the difficulties involved in bringing together two large companies with distinct organisational structures and many disparate parts; indeed we acknowledged them in our earlier Report.[8] Nor do we dispute that the stakes are, and were in 1998, very high.[9] Nevertheless, we see no reason why the organisational changes that Mr Garnier described could not have taken place as an initial part of the 1998 merger. We have no option but to restate our original conclusion on events of 1998 that "the judgement of senior executives must be called into question. They readily embarked on an adventure with major national assets and then equally readily abandoned the enterprise less than a month later without clear cause consistent with the claimed advantages.".[10]

5. Nevertheless, our reaction to the proposed merger in 1998 was broadly positive and we commented that "the creation of a R&D powerhouse, able to compete across the world, and conducting the bulk of its research in the UK would have reflected well on the UK science base and given important signals about the quality of its output".[11] Despite the slightly different terms of the proposed merger this time, which give SmithKline Beecham shareholders 41.25% of the share capital of the new company rather than the 40.5% that they would have received had the 1998 proposals come to fruition, we see no reason to reverse our previous conclusion. **Provided that investment in R&D and involvement with the UK science base is maintained at, as a minimum, the same level as the current combined activities of SmithKline Beecham and Glaxo Wellcome, the creation of Glaxo SmithKline, with an annual R&D budget of some £2.4 billion, of which roughly half is expected to be spent in the UK,[12] is potentially a huge asset for the science base and for the UK economy as a whole.**

6. That proviso is, of course, critically important. We were concerned to learn that the operational, although not the corporate, headquarters of the new company will be in the United States and asked our witnesses whether this would lead to increased pressure to perform a higher proportion of R&D activities there. We were assured that this was not the case.[13] Indeed Mr Garnier pointed out that SmithKline Beecham's operational headquarters had been in the United States for the last eight years and that, during that time, its R&D investment in the UK had doubled.[14] He told us that Glaxo SmithKline wanted "to stay in the UK as long as the environment in the UK is favourable to the pharmaceutical industry, and to research in particular. We have no motivation, in fact it would be against our own interests, to move our

---

[5] Q. 5.

[6] Q. 8.

[7] Q. 8.

[8] Third Report from the Science and Technology Committee, Session 1997-98, on *Glaxo Wellcome and SmithKline Beecham: The Merger Proposals*, HC 627, para 4 (hereafter "*The Merger Proposals*").

[9] Q. 6.

[10] *The Merger Proposals*, para 11.

[11] *The Merger Proposals*, para 5.

[12] Q. 19.

[13] Q. 18.

[14] Q. 10.

operations outside the UK".[15] We were also assured that there was no likelihood of either of the two companies' major R&D centres in the UK, at Stevenage and Harlow, closing as a result of the merger. It was argued that the new company would be "*very dependent on those two sites*", that they are "state of the art" and "represent £1 billion of capital investment".[16]

7. Both Glaxo Wellcome and SmithKline Beecham were, however, frank in their admission that "it is inevitable that job losses will arise as a result of bringing the two companies together" although they did not feel able to be specific about numbers or locations.[17] Nevertheless, they told us that "the rationale for the merger is to sustain investment and leadership in R&D and to create a world leading organisation" and, therefore, that "savings from the consolidation of R&D activities (estimated at £250 million p.a.) will be re-invested into R&D".[18] Mr Garnier told us that the new company would have to "make an effort in eliminating duplication ... and reinvesting the proceeds in new programmes" but argued that "in terms of employment the effect will be minimal. It is more in the way in which we conduct our research and the way in which we discover our new drugs that will change".[19] In response to our questions we were told that this new approach to drug development, driven by scientific advances, and by research on the human genome in particular, provided the major rationale for combining the two companies' R&D activities.[20] **We understand that consolidation of R&D activities will result in estimated savings of £250 million but have been assured that this will be re-invested in R&D and that the employment effect on research facilities will be minimal. We expect the new company to abide by these assurances and shall monitor its R&D activities.**

8. Both companies, however, added an important rider to their assurances of continued investment in, and interaction with, the UK science base. As Sir Richard told us "we cannot support alone the science base, other companies have got to invest in the way that we do in research and development. Also the Government has to invest. The Government has to make sure that the universities remain competitive ... and breed excellence within our top institutions."[21] Mr Garnier stressed the importance of a continuing supply of high quality scientists from academia. He told us that "The role of Government is to make sure that they can provide this rare commodity to the companies that invest in the UK. In my view this is more important than any other consideration" in determining where companies will invest.[22] Ultimately, as our witnesses told us, companies will conduct their R&D activities in the location where it makes the most commercial sense to do to so: "We cannot be parochial in our choice. The best guarantee for British academia to benefit from the alliance [between Glaxo Wellcome and SmithKline Beecham] is to keep the science at the highest possible level of expertise.".[23]

9. This is not a new argument — indeed, we have heard it repeatedly before, most recently during our inquiry into *Engineering and Physical Sciences Based Innovation*.[24] In that Report we made a series of recommendations to Government designed to stimulate a reverse in the trend which has seen, since 1993, a greater drop in the UK in expenditure on R&D as a percentage of gross domestic product than any other G7 nation.[25] We reiterate those sentiments now. The merger, however, does highlight the vulnerability of the UK as more and more companies adopt a global rather than a national perspective on their operations. The merger of Astra and Zeneca resulted in a company with its headquarters in Sweden. Nor is this just a feature of the pharmaceutical industry. Analysis by the Royal Society of Chemistry indicates that the effects of mergers and acquisitions in the conventional chemical sector[26] have included a decline in R&D functions in the UK, the closure of UK corporate research headquarters, a reduction in the

---

[15] Q. 11.
[16] Q. 37.
[17] Ev. p. 3.
[18] Ev. p. 3.
[19] Q. 34.
[20] QQ. 7, 16, and 69.
[21] Q. 19.
[22] Q. 21.
[23] Q. 22.
[24] Second Report, Session 1999-2000, on *Engineering and Physical Sciences Based Innovation*, HC 195–I.
[25] *Engineering and Physical Sciences Based Innovation*, para 17.
[26] The conventional chemicals sector excludes pharmaceuticals, biotechnology, plastics and rubber.

overall number of R&D staff employed in the industry in the UK and a reduced R&D intensity[27] across the sector as a whole.[28] **The Government must ensure that there is a strong public sector research base, at all levels, to provide industry with leading-edge research and the highly skilled staff which are "the life-blood of technology-based industry".[29] Equally it must provide an economic and fiscal environment that supports those who invest in R&D and stimulates such investment on the part of others. Only by achieving these aims can the UK maintain the degree and breadth of excellence in the science base that is essential if UK-based companies are to compete successfully in a knowledge-driven, global economy.**

Conclusions

10. The explanations provided as to why the merger may be completed successfully now when it could not be in 1998 reinforce our original conclusion that the 1998 merger was entered into without adequate initial assessment and collapsed as a result of personal, rather than structural, differences. We welcome the fact that the merger now seems likely to be successfully completed. **Glaxo SmithKline has the potential to become a national champion, competing across the world, and, with nearly 50% of its R&D activities undertaken in the UK, would be a powerful advertisement for the quality and expertise of the UK science base.**

11. The merger of what are already two leading investors in, and beneficiaries of, the UK science base, represents opportunities for the science base to increase its interaction with what will, we expect, be a world-leading pharmaceutical company. These opportunities, however, can only be fully exploited with adequate Government support for public sector scientific and technological endeavour and research infrastructure. **The Government must continue to invest in the science base, and must build on that investment, if companies are to continue to conduct their R&D operations in the UK or, indeed, are to be attracted here from elsewhere. This is essential to the competitiveness of UK industry.**

---

[27] R&D Intensity is a measure of the extent to which sales revenues are re-invested in R&D.

[28] *See* Royal Society of Chemistry: *The Impact of Mergers, Acquisitions and Restructuring on the UK Chemistry Infrastructure.*

[29] HC 195-II, pp. 147-8.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE RELATING TO THE REPORT

MONDAY 27 MARCH 2000

Members present:

Dr Michael Clark, in the Chair

Dr Ian Gibson	Dr Desmond Turner
Dr Brian Iddon	Dr Alan W Williams

The Committee deliberated.

Draft Report (Glaxo Wellcome and SmithKline Beecham), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read the first time.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 11 read and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Fourth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That the provisions of Standing Order No. 134 (Select committees (reports)) be applied to the Report.

Ordered, That the Appendices to the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee be reported to the House. — (*The Chairman.*)

Several Papers were ordered to be reported to the House.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 29 March at a quarter to Four o'clock.

LIST OF WITNESSES
VOLUME II

Wednesday 21 February 2000

GLAXO WELLCOME

	Page
Sir Richard Sykes	4

SMITHKLINE BEECHAM

Mr Jean-Pierre Garnier	4

MEMORANDUM INCLUDED IN THE MINUTES OF EVIDENCE
VOLUME II

Glaxo Wellcome plc and SmithKline Beecham plc 1

LIST OF APPENDICES TO THE MINUTES OF EVIDENCE
VOLUME II

Memoranda from: *Page*

1. The Institute of Professionals, Managers and Specialists (IPMS) 17

2. Manufacturing Science Finance (MSF) 21

3. The Royal Society of Chemistry 23

UNPRINTED MEMORANDA

Additional Memoranda have been received from the following and have been reported to the House, but to save printing costs they have not been printed and copies have been placed in the House of Commons Library where they may be inspected by Members. Other copies are in the Record Office, House of Lords, and are available to the public for inspection. Requests for inspection should be addressed to the Record Office, House of Lords, London, SW1. (Tel 020 7219 3074). Hours of inspection are from 9.30 am to 5.30 pm on Mondays to Fridays.

Annexes to Memorandum from The Royal Society of Chemistry

LIST OF REPORTS

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE REPORTS IN THE CURRENT PARLIAMENT

Session 1997–98

First Report: The Implications of the Dearing Report for the Structure and Funding of University Research (HC 303)

Second Report: The Year 2000—Computer Compliance (HC 342)

Third Report: Glaxo Wellcome and SmithKline Beecham: The Merger Proposals (HC 627)

Fourth Report: The Cloning of Animals from Adult Cells (HC 1039)

Fifth Report: British Biotech (HC 888)

Sixth Report: Science and the Comprehensive Spending Review (HC 1040)

First Special Report: The Government's Response to the Committee's Fourth Report, Session 1996–97, The Research Council System: Issues for the Future (HC 302)

Second Special Report: The Government's Response to the Committee's Third Report, Session 1996–97, The Natural Environment Research Council and Research into Climate Change (HC 306)

Third Special Report: The Government's Response to the Committee's First Report, Session 1997–98, The Implications of the Dearing Report for the Structure and Funding of University Research (HC 799)

Fourth Special Report: The Government's Response to the Committee's Fifth Report, Session 1997–98, British Biotech (HC 1185)

Session 1998–99

First Report: The Scientific Advisory System: Genetically Modified Foods (HC 286)

Second Report: The National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (HC 472)

Third Report: The Scientific Advisory System: Mobile Phones and Health (HC 489)

Fourth Report: The Regulation of the Biotechnology Industry (HC 535)

First Special Report: The Government's Response to the Committee's Sixth Report, Session 1997–98, Science and the Comprehensive Spending Review (HC 234)

Second Special Report: The Government's Response to the Committee's Second Report, The National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (HC 822)

Session 1999–2000

First Report: The Year 2000—Computer Compliance: Follow-Up (HC 535)

Second Report: Engineering and Physical Sciences Based Innovation (HC 195-I)

Third Report: The Scientific Advisory System: Diabetes and Driving Licences (HC 206-I)

Printed in the United Kingdom by The Stationery Office Limited
4/00 504403 19585 CRC Supplied

ISBN 0-10-223800-6

9 780102 238006

Distributed by The Stationery Office Limited
and available from:

The Stationery Office
(Mail, telephone and fax orders only)
PO Box 29, Norwich NR3 1GN
General enquiries *Lo-call* 0845 7 585463
Order through the Parliamentary Hotline *Lo-call* 0845 7 023474
Fax orders 0870 600 5533
Email orders book.orders@theso.co.uk

The Stationery Office Bookshops
123 Kingsway, London WC2B 6PQ
020 7242 6393 Fax 020 7242 6394
68–69 Bull Street, Birmingham B4 6AD
0121 236 9696 Fax 0121 236 9699
33 Wine Street, Bristol BS1 2BQ
0117 9264306 Fax 0117 9294515
9–21 Princess Street, Manchester M60 8AS
0161 834 7201 Fax 0161 833 0634
16 Arthur Street, Belfast BT1 4GD
028 9023 8451 Fax 028 9023 5401
The Stationery Office Oriel Bookshop
18–19 High Street, Cardiff CF1 2BZ
029 2039 5548 Fax 029 2038 4347
71 Lothian Road, Edinburgh EH3 9AZ
0870 606 5566 Fax 0870 606 5588

The Parliamentary Bookshop
12 Bridge Street, Parliament Square
London SW1A 2JX
Telephone orders 020 7219 3890
General enquiries 020 7219 3890
Fax orders 020 7219 3866

Accredited Agents
(see Yellow Pages)

and through good booksellers

© Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2000
Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to the Copyright Unit,
Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2–16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ
– Fax 01603 723000
ISBN 0 10 223800 6